

## REMARKS

Applicant is amending Claims 56 and 78 to better claim the present invention.

Applicant will now address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

#### Claims 56, 59-62 and 64

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 56, 59-62 and 64 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe (US 6,617,784) in view of Ooi (US 5,206,746). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claim 56 is directed to a self-light emitting display device wherein "an inner angle between the light scattering body and the second surface is not less than 60° and is less than 180°."

In the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Abe discloses all of the elements of the claim except the Examiner admits that Abe does not disclose an inner angle between the light scattering body and the second surface that is not less than 60° and is less than 180°. The Examiner, however, relies on Ooi for allegedly curing this deficiency and contends that Ooi discloses "a light scattering element having an inner angle between the light scattering body and the second surface is not less than 60 degrees and is less than 180 degrees." The Examiner then concludes that it would have been obvious to combine these references to arrive at the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the combination of these references to arrive at the claimed invention is improper.

As stated in MPEP 2143.01, obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying

the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so. There is, however, no motivation for one skilled in the art to combine Abe and Ooi to arrive at the claimed invention.

In particular, Abe discloses a light emitted from an EL layer (4) is extracted from a surface (11) of a light scattering body (1). See e.g. Fig.1; col. 1, ln 63 – col. 2, lns. 12 in Abe. In contrast, Ooi discloses a light (60) emitted from an illumination means (8, 18) enters into a light scattering body (2, 12, 42, 52, etc) through the side surface (4A, 4B, 44A, 44B etc) of the light scattering body. See e.g. Figs.1, 2, 5 and 6; col. 17, lns 17-26, in Ooi. Thus, the direction of the light which enters into the light scattering body from the illumination means (EL layer) in Ooi is different from that in Abe. As a result, the light scattering body of Abe and the light scattering body of Ooi are very different and used in a different way. Therefore, there is no motivation for one skilled in the art to combine Abe and Ooi. Hence, the combination of these references is improper.

Further, in the present invention, a light scattering body is provided on an insulator (substrate) which improves extracting efficiency of light from a light emitting element. See e.g. page 6, ln. 22 - page7, ln. 4 and Fig. 4 of the present application. Hence, the light entered into the light scattering body is extracted from a surface of the light scattering body (as shown in the arrow of Fig.4A). In contrast, Ooi discloses a light (50B) entering into a light scattering body (42), reflected on side surfaces (44A, 44B) and finally absorbed by an absorbing face 45A. See Fig. 5; col. 15, ln. 58 - col. 16, ln. 42 in Ooi. Thus, Ooi appears to teach away from a light scattering body for extracting the light from the surface thereof, as in the present invention. Hence, one skilled in the art would not combine Ooi with Abe to arrive at the claimed invention, and the combination is improper.

Therefore, independent Claim 56 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable, and it is

respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 57 and 58, and 63

The Examiner also rejects Claims 57 and 58 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Ooi and further in view of Jones (US 5,920,080), and Claim 63 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Ooi and further in view of Shibata (US 6,147,451). These rejections are also respectfully traversed.

Each of the other rejected claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 78 and 79

The Examiner also rejects Claims 78 and 79 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Ooi and further in view of Duggal (US 6,777,871). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

For similar reasons as those discussed above for independent Claim 56, Claims 78 and 79 are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicant is also adding new Claims 80 and 81. As each of these claims is a dependent claim, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these claims are also

patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and allowed.

If any fee is due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Conclusion


Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our Deposit Account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 16, 2005

  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.  
200 West Adams Street  
Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 000026568